

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9, 10, 17, 29, 30 and 36 are indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, these claims have been so amended and dependent claims (except as noted below) that were not indicated to be allowable, have been amended to be dependent on these allowable claims thereby also bringing them into condition for allowance.

Claim Rejection 35 USC §102

Claim 8 and corresponding apparatus claim 28 have been amended to improve their clarity. Each of these claims concerns the situation where an added shared resource has the same name as an existing shared resource, but perhaps for reasons of lack of upward compatibility, both resources must be maintained for active use by both the new component and by older components. This portion of the invention is described at page 11 of the present application beginning at line 23 which describes directing the operating system to check the directory of the application program (new component) before checking the common directory for the shared resources so as to permit this availability of two resources with identical names.

"If the pre-existing resource is not upwardly compatible with the new resource, then the program proceeds to process block 86 and the new resource is added to a directory in which the new software components 44 is loaded. The operating system 34 may, when called on by software components 38 for particular resources, check the directory of the application program before checking a common directory for the particular resource. Thus both resources may co-exist without conflict. It will be understood that other methods of segregating the resources for unambiguous use by different applications may be used for different types of operating systems."

In light of this amendment, the rejection of claims 8 and 35 under 35 USC §103 in light of Altberg and Chamberlain is respectfully traversed. Chamberlain teaches the backing up of old files to a separate location that arguably might be combined with Altberg for the purposes of restoring the older versions of shared

resources in the event of instability. However, in this case, both versions of the shared resource would not be accessible. The backup versions would be intentionally inaccessible in order to prevent the old versions of the resources from being inadvertently used. As now expressly claimed in claims 8 and 28, both versions must be usable by installed components, not backups. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 8 and 13 are now in condition for allowance.

In light of these remarks and conclusions it is believed that claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17-20, 22-26, 28-31, 33-34, and 36-39 are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Although no additional fees are believed to be due for filing this amendment, if an additional fee is deemed to be due, please charge any fees due to Deposit Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINALD W. SPRECHER, *et al.*

By: 

Keith M. Baxter
Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719